

C O P Y

HEADQUARTERS EIGHTH ARMY
Office of the Staff Judge Advocate
APO 343
24 January 1946

CASE # 1

UNITED STATES : REVIEW OF STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE
VS : Board of Review:
TATSUO TSUCHIYA : Reichmann, Willis, Judge Advocate

*****OPINION BY REICHMANN *****

L. The attached record of trial by Military Commission appointed by paragraph 14, Special Orders Number 330, Headquarters Eighth Army, dated 13 December 1945, having been referred to the Staff Judge Advocate Eighth Army, dated 4 June 1945, review of same, with opinion and recommendations and reasons therefor, is herewith submitted.

PERSONAL DATA CONCERNING ACCUSED

TATSUO TSUCHIYA (Tautchia, Tacia, Techicia sen), civilian guard (formerly corporal, Japanese army), attached to army at Mitsuchima Prisoner of War Camp, Honahu, Japan, also in charge of clothing and supplies.

Tried at	:	Headquarters, Eighth Army, APO 343 Yokohama, Japan, 18 December 1945 -- 27 December 1945.
Age	:	28 years
Marital status	:	Married 8 April 1943
Children	:	Two, under two years of age.

2. Synopsis of Charges, Opinion, and Recommendations:

<u>Charge and Specification</u>	<u>Plea</u>	<u>Findings</u>	<u>Legally Sustained</u>
Charge: Violation of Laws and Customs of War - at Mitsuchima Prisoner of War camp between November 1942 and September 1945 (R 23), committed atrocities against prisoners of war.	Not Guilty (R 18, 23)	Guilty (R 208)	Yes
Spec. 1: About 5 March 1943, jointly with seven others, beat and killed Private First Class Teas.	Not Guilty (R 18)	Guilty (R 208)	Yes
Spec. 2: November, 1944, jointly with three others beat Sergeant Landquist.	Not Guilty (R 18)	Guilty (R 208)	Yes
Spec. 3: Between November 1942 and May 1944, beat Private First Class Kolilis.	Not Guilty (R 18)	Guilty (R 208)	
Spec. 4: Between November 1942 and May 1944, beat Major Cory	Not Guilty (R 18)	Not Guilty on defense Motion (R 123)	

<u>Charge and Specification</u>	<u>Pleas</u>	<u>Findings</u>	<u>Legally Sustained</u>
Spec 5: During September 1944 beat Private Vigil.	Not Guilty (R 18)	Not Guilty Guilty (R 208)	
Spec 6: About 15 June 1945 beat Private Vigil.	Not Guilty (R 18)	Not Guilty Guilty (R 208)	
Spec 7: During January and March 1945 (R 16), forcing prisoners to face each other in two ranks and slap each other.	Not Guilty (R 18)	Not Guilty Guilty (R 208)	Yes
Spec 8: Between November 1943 and May 1944, misappropriate and withholding Red Cross supplies.	Not Guilty (R 18)	Not Guilty on Defense Motion (R 123)	
Maximum Sentence	: Death		
Sentence Adjudged	: Life imprisonment at hard labor		
Sentence Recommended	: Life imprisonment at hard labor		

3. The record of trial in this case comes to this headquarters for an automatic appellate review, the primary function of which is to assure that the accused has been neither deprived of nor denied the rights and protection afforded to him before a military commission trying an accused war criminal. Consequently, those specifications of which the accused was found guilty, or which were dismissed by the commission during the trial, present nothing to be considered on review. Hence, this review will be confined to a consideration of the record of trial insofar as it pertains to specifications 1, 2, and 7, of which the accused was found guilty.

4. Summary of the Evidence:

a. For the Prosecution:

By the exchange of correspondence through the Seiso Legation, the Japanese Government agreed to apply "mitatis Mutandis", the convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war (R 20, 21, Ex. 1).

With reference to specification 1, Private First Class Robert Gordon Teas (Ex 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 19) (referred to as "Tease", Ex 5, 7, 12, "Teases", Ex 17, and "Thies", Ex 18), 19 Bomb Group, A.A.F., was a prisoner of war at the Mitsuishima Prisoner of War Camp, Honshu, Japan. Some time in the fore part of 1943 (3 Jan 43, Ex 17; 20 Jan 43, Ex 12; 27 Feb 43, Ex 4; Feb 43, Ex 7; 2 Mar 43, Ex 4), Teas, having been accused of (Ex 7, 14, 16, 28), or caught taking (Ex 4) or stealing (Ex 6, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20) some food, clothing, or Red Cross supplies, and though ill with dysentery and malaria (Ex 14, 16, 28), was beaten (Ex 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20) constantly (Ex 18), many times (Ex 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 17, 19, 20) daily (Ex 10), kicked (Ex 18) and slashed across the face (Ex 28) with knotted ropes (Ex 3, 14, 16) and clubs (Ex 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20) about the face and head (Ex 3, 6, 14, 18) which become "swollen to about twice its normal size" (Ex 17) until he became unconscious (Ex 3, 11, 16, 19). The evidence shows these beatings occurred at the washstand outside the barracks (Ex 3), in the

guardhouse (Ex 4), in front of the administrative building (Ex 12) and in the kitchen (Ex 17). While in the hospital (Ex 2, 12, 28), as a result of beating (Ex 6) Teas was beaten by accused about three hours before he died (Ex 18). Teas was also stripped of his clothes in the yard at which time there was about 1 1/2 inches of snow on the ground and ice water was thrown on him (Ex 4). Accused, Tatsuo Teuchiya (Ex 15), also referred to as Teutchia (Ex 3). Taesa (Ex 5), Tochia (Ex 17), Tuchia (Ex 20), Tchicia San (Ex 25) and Suchiyah (Ex 28), and known to the prisoners of war as "little glass eye" (Ex 3, 4, 6, 15) and "glass eye" (Ex 4, 8), inflicted this abuse in conjunction with Corporal Kanichi Yoshizawa, also known as "Mush Mouth" (Ex 3, 4, 5, 12, 15, 28), Kimura (Ex 5), Kanmura san (Ex 17), a Japanese known as Kawata, Kawata, and "Rivet Tooth" (Ex 3, 6, 12), Fujimoto, known as "Punk" (Ex 12), a guard known as "Big Glass Eye" (Ex 6), Shodie, a Japanese orderly (Ex 10) and a Japanese interpreter called "Mickey Mouse" (Ex 3). Tuchia was "particularly vicious and took a sadistic delight in beating men with anything that came to his hands on the slightest provocation." (Ex 20), subsequent to these acts (about 4 1/2 hours later (Ex 3), a few days (Ex 8), 5th day (Ex 12), two or three days (Ex 14), about 24 hours (Ex 17) three days (Ex 18), two days (Ex 20) Teas died (Ex 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 28) from complications resulting from the beatings (Ex 19). As one witness to a beating says, "He ("Glass Eye"), struck PFC Teas repeatedly over the head, and after one of the blows PVT Teas fell, struck the back of his head on the concrete. He died a few days later" (Ex 8). One affiant relates "he (Teas) was too weak to get up and was taken to the hospital where he died later of Pneumonia" (Ex 7). The death certificate (Ex 21) showing the cause of death on 5 March 1943 as "acute enteritis", bears the name of Hiroyuki Takano, who, testifying in court, gave his name as Ohara, Hiroyoshi (R 83). He stated that in the early part of March, 1943 (R 84), he, an optometrist, was the medical officer at Mitsuishima Prisoner of War Camp and signed death certificates. (R 86). Although the copy of the Teas death certificate (Ex 21) bore Takao's name, he did not recall signing the original (R 87), and did not see the bodies of all prisoners for which he wrote death certificates (R 86). All medical officers had orders from Tokyo Internment Camp to sign death certification without actually knowing the cause of death (R 86). Captain Max Werner of the US Army Medical Corps testified that injuries, such as inflicted upon Teas, might have caused his death (R 90, 91), and that a death certificate, made without seeing the deceased, is of no value (R 91).

With reference to Specification 2, Sergeant Gerald John Lundquist, Army of the United States, by his own affidavit, related that in the latter part of November, 1944, while a prisoner of war at Mitsuishima Camp, a friend had substituted for him as fire guard, and when the Japanese discovered this, "Little Glass Eye", "Punk", "Big Glass Eye", and a Japanese interpreter, got him out of bed at night, required him to stand at attention in the prison compound for forty-five minutes while they beat him on the face with wooden slippers and fists, causing his face to be badly bruised and swollen, after which he was required to stand naked at attention in the prison compound in freezing weather. (Ex 24).

With reference to Specification 7, on two occasions, in January and March, 1945, the guards, including "Little Glass Eye" and "Big Glass Eye", not being satisfied with the work of the details on the rock piles, required the prisoners to face each other in two lines and beat each other in the face with their fists for an hour. Meanwhile the guards, including "Little Glass Eye", and "Big Glass Eye", went along this line beating the prisoners with a wooden club, (Ex 26, 27). Tomatsu Kimura, a defense witness, stated on cross-examination that he had heard once of this occurrence (R 154).

b. For the Defense.

Makotima Sudo, (R 123-129), commandant of the Mitsuishima Prisoner of War Camp (R 123) never heard the name "Little Glas Eye", (R 125), but testified that Tatsuo Tsuchiya was an assistant in the clothing department and also guarded prisoners, (R 124). Tsuchiya was "very gentle and considerate" (R 125), had no authority to punish prisoners, and witness never ordered nor received any report that Tsuchiya beat prisoners. (R 124). Witness inspected the hospital daily, but saw no prisoners who had been beaten (R 127), nor any dead bodies with scars or injuries (R 129). He remembered two or three instances where prisoners had been put in the guardhouse for stealing Red Cross Supplies. After a repetition of such offense, the punishment imposed was to "have the other prisoners beat the one who committed" the offense (R 127).

Harumi Kawata, (R 130-135), errand boy for the Mitsuishima Camp Commander (R 134) from 10 December 1942 to 28 July 1943, knew Tsuchiya as "impartial and fair" (R 133). He never saw Tsuchiya inflict physical punishment (R 132) but "heard" of it. (R 131). Once he saw a prisoner of war at Mitsuishima camp beaten by Yoshigawa, but did not remember who was beaten. (R 135). He heard of a prisoner being confined for stealing something but did not know who it was (R 134). He did not know anyone by the name of Tens, nor Landquist. (R 132) Tsuchiya, and two other camp personnel had artificial eyes (R 132).

Yokichi Nishino, (R 135-142), a guard and administrative section employee at Mitsuishima Camp from 28 December 1942 to the end of the war, except for the period April, 1944 to April 1945, observed Tsuchiya treated prisoners "strictly with fairness" (R 136) and never saw him strike a prisoner (R 136) except for the customary Japanese slapping punishment (R 141). He did not know or recall whether it was customary at Mitsuishima Camp to strike prisoners with clubs, knotted ropes, rubber shoes (R 142).

Koshiki Matsuzaki, (R 142-149), a civilian guard at Mitsuishima Camp from 26 November 1942, to 4 September 1945, knew Tsuchiya had an artificial eye and that his attitude toward prisoners was "very diligent" (R 144). Prisoners were slapped (R 143) which was a Japanese army custom (R 144). By decision of the senior American Officer (R 148), he never heard of any prisoner being struck with clubs, ropes or wooden slippers (R 147), but recalled two or three instances of prisoners being struck with a stick., (R 146, 148) many prisoners died prior to March 1943, having contracted illness aboard ship (R 145).

Tomotaka Kimura, (R 149-155), a guard at Mitsuishima Camp from 10 December 1942 to 3 December 1945, believed Tsuchiya "executed his duty faithfully and well" (R 149). Prisoners disobeyed orders (R 149), cut their shoes with knives, and failed to wash their clothes (R 155). Few prisoners were punished by confinement (R 149) and the Japanese custom of slapping (R 151) but not with clubs, except by the prisoners of war (R 153). He heard about the guards lining up American and British prisoners in ranks and making them slap or beat each other (R 154).

The accused, Tatsuo Tsuchiya, at his own request was sworn (R 161-178, 182-183). He is a former corporal in the Japanese Army, 28 years old, married, and has two children. Before becoming a guard, and having charge of clothing and other supplies at Mitsuishima Camp (R 163, 170, 171) he was a farmer and mat-maker. Prisoners disobeyed orders and he slapped them with his open hand (R 164, 172) about eight or nine times (R 167) by order of his superiors (R 177), which was also according to Japanese custom, as he had received while in the Japanese Army.

(R 164, 165). He treated prisoners "fairly and squarely" and "looked after the protection and the interests" (R 167). He did not know Teas (R 165) nor Sergeant Landquist (R 166), as prisoners were addressed by their numbers (R 165), not did that he was nicknamed "Little Glass Eye" (R 170). Except for slapping (R 169-170), he categorically denied committing the various forms of abuse and mistreatment of prisoners with which he was charged, and as indicated in the prosecution's evidence (R 165-167, 169-170).

5. Opinion.

The instant case is the first to come to this office for review after trial by a military commission under the procedure established by letter, AG OOO.5 (5 Dec 45) LS, General Headquarters, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, (herein referred to as SCAP) dated, 5 December 1945, subject: Regulations Governing the Trials of accused War Criminals.

These regulations provide for the composition of the commission, the prosecutors and their duties, the commission's jurisdiction over persons and offenses, and establish the powers and procedure of the commission including the scope of evidentiary admissibility and the rights of the accused. The authority of the Supreme Commander to establish such commission is not and cannot be challenged (Fairman, The Law of Martial Rule, page 273). However, some of the rules therein established depart from the principles followed in American judicial courts and United States courts-martial, and so far as pertinent to this case they will be subsequently discussed.

Charges against accused, received by the defense on 13 December 1945, were, on 14 December 1945, read to the accused and referred to the Commission for trial. At the trial, held from 18 December 1945 to 27 December 1945, Tauchiya was represented by an individual Japanese civilian counsel in addition to the regularly appointed defense counsel.

Accused, examined and challenged one member of the commission for cause as having previously, during the war, been a prisoner of war of the Japanese. The challenged member was not sworn for his examination on the challenge, but the challenge was sustained, and the challenged member withdrew. The error, if any, in failing to swear the challenged member was thereby cured.

Accused moved to strike specifications 7 and 8 which was denied. Specification 7 will be considered. One basis for the motion was that since the specification alleged an offense of forming prisoners of war in two ranks and forcing them to slap each other, such slapping was not an offense under the laws of war since the Japanese Army for a minor dereliction may be recognized, it was nowhere asserted, for recognized or practiced in the Japanese Army. The other grounds for the motion to strike are that the specifications alleges more than one offense against unidentified individuals at uncertain times and dates. To be fairly apprised of the accusations against him is all to which an accused is entitled. The SCAP rules and regulations require the specifications to be "clearly worded". A reading of the specifications, as amended in open court, gives a clear word-picture of accused's alleged criminal conduct, and while dates and names are omitted, an allegation of such information is not essential to properly plead the alleged offense, inasmuch as specific dates and names are immaterial if the acts were committed at some times during the alleged period on some prisoners of war.

The denial of the motion to strike was proper.

From the foregoing considerations it is also concluded that the denial of the defense motion for more specific statement as to specifications 7 and 8 was proper.

The presumption of innocence obtains in trials of accused persons before military commissions and accused's plea of not guilty to the charge and all specifications, as amended, placed on the prosecutions the burden to prove the accused guilty beyond a reasonable doubt by evidence, competent under international law and the SCAP rules governing the procedure in trials before military commissions.

The SCAF rules direct that such evidences admissible as in the Commission's opinion "would be of assistance in proving or disproving the charge" or "would have probative value in the mind of a reasonable man", including, among other things, "affidavits, depositions or other signed statements". Any evidence which would be of assistance in proving or disproving the charge must necessarily have "probative value", as the basis for evidentiary usefulness follows the established precedent of Ex parte Quirin, 317 U. S. 1, 29-30 (See Fairman, The Law of Martial Law, page 175).

The prosecution's case rests largely on affidavits and other written statements, whose introduction in evidence being opposed by the defense, at the outset and throughout the trial, presents one major issue which will now be considered.

Briefly stated, defense objected to the admission of affidavits on the grounds that: (1) they violate Articles Of War 25 and 33, the 6th Amendment to the United States Constitution, and the procedure in United States courts and courts-martial; (2) that the affidavits are Ex parte and accused's right of cross-examination is denied; and (3) no military necessity exists to warrant the use of such procedure.

Enemy belligerents are not entitled to the protection of United States constitutional guarantees (Brown vs U.S., 8 Branch 122-123; de Lacary vs U.S., 249 Fed 625; Ex Parte Quirin, supra). It therefore follows that rules of evidence in United States District courts do not apply to military commissions created to try war criminals under international law. Although military commissions are mentioned in the Articles of War, nothing is said to define their powers in the trial of enemy war criminals. The source of power to punish enemy war criminals emanates from other parts of the constitution such as "to provide for the common defense" rather than from the power to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" (See Opinion of General Myron P. Cramer, the Judge Advocate General, even to Brigadier General John M. Weir, Director, War Crimes Office, Subject: Applicability of Articles of War to Trials of War Criminals by Military Commission, page 2). General Cramer in the opinion referred to also said:

"The Supreme Court in Ex parte Quirin, 317 U.S. 1 29-30, has already held that Congress by providing in the Articles of War for the trial of offenses committed by enemy belligerents 'has not itself undertaken to codify that branch of international law or to mark its precise boundaries, or to enumerate or define by statute all the acts which that law condemns.' If, therefore, Congress has not invaded the substantive field of those offenses, there is a fair inference, proof to the contrary lacking, that it did not intend to enter the procedural field in that respect." Therefore, Congress did not intend the articles of war to apply to military commissions trying enemy belligerents or civilians for war crimes." (Opinion of General Myron P. Cramer, supra).

It follows, therefore, that the rules of evidence generally applicable to commissions governed by international law will resolve the issue of the admissibility of evidence in the instant case. On this subject, Colonel Archibald King, Chief, International Law Division, Office the Judge Advocate General, in an opinion of the Judge Advocate General on perpetuating testimony for presentation to an International military tribunal states:

"The reasons which havelled to the adoption of liberal rules by international tribunal generally would seem to be just as fully present in cases brought before an international criminal court, and therefore to warrant the adoption of similar rules" (Memorandum for the Judge Advocate General, SPJGW, 1945/5465, 18 June 1945, par 3) "Technical rules of evidence, such as they have been developed in the Anglo-Saxon law, are not observed. Restrictive principles which might straight-jacket the quest for truth in a web of formalistic procedure have uniformly been ignored." (Ibid, par 4) "A specific grant of authority to admit such evidence as affidavits, unsworn statements and the like, is not essential, under well-established customary rule of the law of nations such materials are admissible, it being left to the tribunal to determine what weight shall be attributed it them." (Ibid, par 7).

Since it is clear that affidavits and written statements are admissible under international law, it follows that absence of military necessity is no ground for challenging their introduction in the present case. Hence, the introduction of relevant affidavits and other written instruments was proper and violated no right of the accused.

Hearsay evidence, like affidavits, has probative value differing only in degree, and the commission properly admitted such evidence (R.00) to be given such weight as the commission deemed it to be entitled. In passing, it is noted that Lieutenant Day, a member of the prosecution, testified with respect to the taking of an affidavit (Ex 4, R 111), after which it was received in evidence, and the law member ruled that Lieutenant Day's appearance before the commission as a witness did not disqualify him to further participate in the prosecution. This was not error.

The record, considered in the light of the foregoing comments, contains no evidence erroneously admitted in contravention of the principles, nor beyond the limits of the evidentiary scope of trials before military commissions conducted under international law.

The competency of the evidence received by the commission having now been shown and determined, there remains the sufficiency to be considered with respect to the offenses of which accused was found guilty.

As to specification 1, an abundance of accumulative and corroborative evidence shows that accused in the fore part of 1943 in conjunction or participating with other named individuals, beat an American prisoner of war named Teas, using clubs and knotted ropes on several occasions and at several places in the Mitsubishi Prisoner of War Camp and, shortly after one such beating, Teas died, which death, as shown by expert medical testimony, might be expected to follow such beatings. While the death certificate states "acute enteritis" as the cause of death, the Japanese medical officer who prepared it did not recall signing it, and moreover, he stated that he, under superior orders, signed death certificates without knowing the cause of death. Any presumption of regularity in favor of the issuance of the death certificate is therefore destroyed, and its credibility discredited. Accused was variously referred to in the record as Tauchiya, Tautchia, Taces, Tchchia, Tuchia, Tchicia San, Suchiyah and "Little Glass Eye". Proof of identity by means of affidavits can be expected to be difficult, but under the rule of *idem sonans*, the similarity of sound as applied to the accused's name in the present case, leaves no doubt that he is one and the same person referred to by the different names, who perpetrated the alleged atrocities.

As to Specification 2, Sergeant Lundquist personally relates the circumstances of the beating administered to him by the accused and other named individuals (Ex 24). While no rule exists to preclude a finding of guilty from resting on a single affidavit, such is not the prevalence of conditions fertile for the commission of such atrocities and this affords substantial corroboration thereof.

As to Specification 7, the evidence (Ex 27) was supplied by a victim of the atrocity who narrated his experience as one of the prisoners formed in two ranks and forced to slap each other while accused and other guards went down the line beating them with a club. Commission of this type of atrocity was not only corroborated by another prisoner of war (Ex 26) but by one of the defense witnesses (R 154) as well.

One prisoner stated that accused was "particularly vicious and took a sadistic delight in beating men with anything that came to his hands," whereas, on the other hand, defense witnesses, all of whom had some connection with Mitsuhashi Camp, were in uniform agreement that accused was "very gentle and very considerate", "impartial and fair" and "executed his duty faithfully". Peculiarly, however, none knew, or at least they did not remember, of any beatings in Mitsuhashi Camp except a few slappings as practiced in the Japanese Army. One witness had "heard" of American and British prisoners being lined up and forced to slap each other.

It is notable that defense witnesses knew only one or two of the top ranking prisoners by name and the accused did not know either Teas nor Lundquist. This lack of observation, interest, or memory, maybe well bear on their credibility - including accused, who, admitting his lack of information, yet claimed that he "looked after the protection and the interests" of the prisoners. A reasonable mind could not associate substantial credibility to such testimony under the circumstances.

The Commission found the evidence sufficient to prove accused guilty of the specifications under consideration, and the record, in my opinion, contains competent evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt all elements of the offenses charged in specification, 1, 2, and 7, and the charge, and the findings of guilty thereof, and, moreover, contains no error which prejudicially affect the substantial rights of the accused under international law before a military commission such as heard his case.

6. Recommendation:

The maximum penalty for violation of the laws of war being death the sentence imposed is legal. Accused, at the time of the alleged offense, was a civilian, attached to the army, living in Nagano Prefecture with his wife and two children. He had been working as a civilian guard at the Mitsuhashi Prisoner of War Camp from December, 1942 to September, 1945, and formerly was a corporal in the Japanese Army, with prior active war service in China, where, in 1941, he received battle injuries in the right shoulder and left eye, as a result of which he had an artificial eye. He testified that he "looked after the protection and the interest" of the prisoners and treated them "fairly and squarely", and implied to the commission that his injuries incapacitated him from physically performing the offenses ascribed to him, except for admitted slapping. He was aware of his duty to protect and treat prisoners fairly, yet the evidence overwhelmingly shows that he was wontonly derelict therein. His testimony in his own behalf with his lack of recollection and categorical denials lacks an indicia of credence inescapably apparent from a review of the record. No basis is found at this time for clemency or mitigation of the term of confinement adjudged.

Subsequent to the conclusion of the trial, petitions have been received from accused, and from others in his behalf, asking clemency and urging as reasons therefor, accused's previous good personal background toget her with the consequent hardship in accused's family arising

(Review of Staff Judge Advocate Cont'd)

from his confinement. This basis for seeking clemency is one that normally or frequently, follows a conviction, and presents nothing peculiarly persuasive nor specially noticeable in affecting accused's position. The petitions are attached to the record and having been considered, I find nothing therein to warrant clemency at this time.

Accordingly, approval of the sentence is recommended and designation of the Sugamo Prison as the place of confinement until such time as proper authority shall designate or establish any other place of confinement,

A form of action designated to affect the foregoing is attached for your consideration and signature, should it meet with your approval.

BOARD OF REVIEW:

RICHARD REICHMANN
Lt. Col. JAGD

BENJAMIN C. WILLIS,
Capt., JAGD.

I have read the record of trial and I concur in the foregoing review.

GAYLE H. NICHOLS.
Lt. Col. JAGD
Actg Staff Judge Advocate.